

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CARLOS F.,

Defendant and Appellant.

D055372

(Super. Ct. No. J221913)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County,
Dwayne K. Moring, Judge. Affirmed.

A petition was filed in the juvenile court accusing Carlos F. (minor) of malicious damage and destruction of personal property in violation of Penal Code section 594, subdivision (a)(b)(1). Following an adjudication hearing the court found the allegations in the petition to be true beyond a reasonable doubt. The minor was placed on probation.

The minor filed a timely notice of appeal.

FACTS

On April 28, 2008, Lori Persinger saw the minor and his friend standing close to her car in the parking lot of the mall where she was employed. Persinger observed the minor making a swiping motion toward her car. Persinger ran over to her car and confronted the minor who was standing on the passenger side of her car. He had a set of keys in his hand. She accused the minor of "keying" her car, which he denied. The minor and his friend walked away and left in a car. Persinger was able to get a description of the car and the license number, which she provided to the police.

After the minor and his friend left, Persinger inspected her car and found the scratch on the rear passenger side of the car. The car was repaired for a total cost of \$533.10. The minor and his friend testified that the minor did not "key" the car.

DISCUSSION

Appointed counsel has filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings below. Counsel presents no argument for reversal, but asks this court to review the record as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to as possible but not arguable issues: (1) whether there was sufficient evidence to support the finding; and (2) whether all of the probation conditions imposed on the minor were valid.

We granted the minor permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded.

A review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, including the possible issues referred to by

appellate counsel, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issues. The minor has been adequately represented by counsel on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

AARON, J.

IRION, J.